

THE Organized FARMER

BARD
S
1
F23349
v.25:
no.1-18
1964

Vol. 25 April 21, 1964 No. 10

Progress Report On Market Plebiscite

By Ed Nelson

Ed Nelson, co-ordinator of the F.U.A. - A.F.A. Joint Hog Marketing Committee's education program for a Hog Marketing Board in Alberta, offers this interim report on the campaign thus far.

Following the approval of a resolution requesting a plebiscite on a hog marketing board by the F.U.A. Convention in December, and by the A.F.A. in January, a committee representing both organizations reviewed the original plan for a Provincial Hog Marketing Board prepared in 1962. In consultation with the legal department of the Provincial Department of Agriculture, the plan was brought up to date by removing unnecessary words and phrases and clarifying certain clauses. No changes were made that would in any way change the intent of the plan. That is, to provide a central agency to

market commercial slaughter hogs in Alberta, operating under legislative powers which guarantee that neither buyers or sellers could by-pass this agency. In the summer of 1962 every F.U.A. local in Alberta was notified that a plan was available for study. They were given an outline of the purposes of the plan. Since no representation was ever made by any local, disapproving the plan, the committee officially presented the plan to the Minister of Agriculture for the approval of the Cabinet, along with a request for a plebiscite at the earliest possible time.

Since it was quite evident that people opposed to a board, had the sympathy of most of the communications media (newspapers, radio, TV) in the province, it was felt that the F.U.A. and the A.F.A. must take the responsibility for presenting a positive approach to marketing boards. To make this possible, a number of people, who

F.U.A. DISTRICT CONVENTIONS 1964

- District 1 — June 17
- District 2 — June 18
- District 3 — June 20
- District 4 — June 25, Legion Hall, St. Paul
- District 5 — June 22
- District 6 — June 23
- District 7 — June 26
- District 8 — June 18, Forestburg School Auditorium
- District 9 — June 19, Ponoka
- District 10 — June 15
- District 11 — June 17
- District 12 — June 16, Okotoks Community Hall

were in sympathy with the purposes of the plan, were brought to Edmonton for a briefing to prepare them to go to meetings in the country and lead discussions on a Hog Marketing Board. The following outline of the procedure to be used, was approved.

1. State as concisely as possible the historical progress of marketing in Canada.
2. State the difference between a co-operative and a board.
3. Compare (using charts) present marketing arrangements for hogs and board marketing.
4. Control of the board would be vested in the farmer and it is his responsibility if a board is established.
5. A Board's objective:
 - (a) Maximum bargaining for all—equal rights—shared advantage.
 - (b) Reduce cost of assembly—avoid duplication—planned direction.
 - (c) Promote quality.
 - (d) Provide positive market information and interpret the trends, create better production reporting, etc.
 - (e) Possible pork promotion to increase market prospects.
 - (f) Could organize some form of production planning and delivery.
 - (g) Sell all hogs produced for slaughter.
6. State clearly what a board could not and would not do.
 - (a) Impose quotas or production control.
 - (b) Hold hogs off market.
 - (c) Create higher price than the consumer will pay, bearing in mind competition from other meats and protein foods as well as International trade.
7. Alternatives for producers:
 - (a) Continue as we are.
 - (b) Direct arrangements between producer and processor (contracts).
 - (c) Processor entering directly into production.
 - (d) Consumers owning all means of production and distribution.
 - (b), (c) and (d) would be

District Conventions Begin

First two of 14 annual F.U.A. District Conventions were held April 1 and 2 in Lethbridge and Medicine Hat. F.U.A. President Paul Babey, F.W.U.A. President Mrs. Russell Johnston, and Jr. President Ken Jensen attended both.

Key topic at the conventions were Marketing Boards and Farm Organization. At District 14, a panel discussion on marketing boards saw George Ross and Dr. Mark Stringham take the negative side, while Anders Anderson with Gerald Hutchinson supported positive arguments. In District 13, a report on the setting up of Sub-district organizations pointed out that these bodies could easily form the nucleus of county units in a future farm organization.

DISTRICT 13 CONVENTION

Seventy-five persons attended the District 13 Convention in Medicine Hat on April 2nd. Delegates reported this Convention as being one of the best ever, due to the challenge presented in the two topics foremost at hand; Farm Organization and the Proposed Hog Marketing Board. F.U.A. and F.W.U.A. Directors were re-elected by acclamation.

Director Jack Muza expressed the hope in his report that a close study will be made by the F.U.A. and A.F.A. of the Platt report and its recommendations. District 13 having set up Sub District Boards in the past year; the nucleus of the County Team which is similar to the County Unit suggested by the Platt Committee.

F.W.U.A. Director Mrs. Thelma Duby of Rainier, spoke on the activities of the women in District 13 and of her activities with the Central Board.

Sub-Directors Jim Musgrove, Walter Nelson, George Verhaest and Emil Chomistek each reported briefly on the membership and activities of their own Sub-Districts.

Junior President Ken Jensen of Ponoka made reference to the

high percentage of rural youth leaving the farm. He also outlined the progress of Gold Eye Camp and the Junior projects slated for this year.

President Paul Babey was warmly received by the Convention as he related the F.U.A. submissions made to the Government. He pointed out that through the efforts of the F.U.A. the Alberta Government is now prepared to set up test areas for Crop Insurance; but on the other hand, the Government who claims to promote home industry, has neglected to protect a segment of agriculture in Alberta, dairying, by allowing the sale of colored margarine.

F.W.U.A. President Mrs. Louise Johnston, commented on the various subjects contained in the brief to the Provincial Government and on "Women's Place in Farm Organization."

A. H. Anderson, F.U.A. Vice-President, reported on the Proposed Hog Marketing Board, and projected that should a Board not be established, vertical integration could mean the eventual elimination of all but large scale hog production. He outlined the mechanics of the proposed board, and of the present system of marketing hogs.

Major Opportunity For Aiding Junior Program

Open to all members of the F.U.A., F.W.U.A., or Junior F.U.A. between 18 and 27 years of age, the Junior Farm Leader of the Year Awards Competition marks a new attempt to spark interest in the work of the Junior F.U.A.

Of major importance is the decision that entries in this contest must be sponsored by a local. Each local may enter only one candidate. The local is required to sponsor the candidate to the Junior F.U.A. Annual Meeting at Gold Eye Lake this summer (board and transportation).

This is a great opportunity for locals to aid the development work of the Junior organization. Deadline for entries is June 10, 1964.

No member of F.U.A., F.W.U.A. or of Junior F.U.A. boards of directors is eligible for the contest. Entrants should be active in community affairs, and good at public speaking. A letter of recommendation from a minister or teacher must accompany the entry.

The winner will receive a trophy and \$25 cash, and a scholarship to the Western Co-op College or the Leadership Techniques Course

at Banff; or a trip to the Montana Farmers' Union Jr. Camp (which ever he or she chooses). The runner ups will each receive one of the remaining awards.

Locals are urged to enter a young person from their district. This can only benefit the young person entered, and it will help the Jr. F.U.A. as well as the total Farm Movement.



Ken Jensen Jr. President

Market Board Debate Involves Thousands

During the past two months, several thousand Alberta hog producers, and others interested in

various degrees of vertical integration and would eliminate the market place.

While the idea of holding meetings to which speakers with opposing views would be invited was not discouraged, it was not encouraged either. The main reason for not encouraging such meetings was the concern that neither view would be properly explored or analysed. As a general rule, time does not permit anything more than a simple statement of opinion. To attempt the analysis of more than one opinion in one meeting becomes an exercise of frustration.

In addition to the foregoing, arrangements were made to bring two members of the Ontario Hog Marketing Board to Alberta so that people could hear, first hand, how the Ontario Board operates, and to clear up any questions that we might have regarding their work. The chairman Mr. Lance Dickieson with Paul Babey, attended nine meetings in the

(Continued on page 4)

the future of the hog industry in this province, have had a part in the Alberta Hog Marketing Board debate.

More than one hundred FUA sponsored meetings, attracting from 30 to 300 people at a time, gave many producers a chance to become acquainted with the issues. They now must weigh the advantages to be gained from this different approach to the marketing of their product.

Since the end of the recent Session of the Alberta Legislature, the Cabinet has been studying the proposed plan for a Marketing Board submitted by the Alberta farm organization's joint Hog Marketing Committee. Producers are now waiting for the Government to announce when a plebiscite on the issue will be held.

Many FUA locals, which have called meetings to discuss the proposed plan, report interest very high. Most say that the number of people attending these meetings has been greater than usual, due to the Hog Marketing Board issue. Support for the marketing board principle, voiced by producers at these meetings, has been general and strong.

With spring work beginning to roll in most parts, Marketing Board promotion is tapering off. Activity in this sector will likely pick up again when the plebiscite is called.

Freedom Fund

Let's tip our hats to the Smoky Lake F.W.U.A.! These ladies have made one of the largest donations to the Hog Marketing Board Fund to date: \$100.

While awaiting a more complete report, we can say that meetings held throughout the province have also been sending in a considerable amount, from "passing the hat." Grande Prairie \$44, Vermilion \$14, Vegreville \$42, Lloydminster \$57, St. Paul \$65, Athabasca \$14, Westlock \$51. More individual donations are coming in. If you wish to add yours, just send it c/o Farmers' Union of Alberta, 9934-106 St., Edmonton.



MEETING TO SAY GOODBYE: After 18 meetings, and a total of 3,000 miles by car around Alberta, these four men met in the same place only once, just before the two Ontario hog men left for home. Shown are (left to right): Paul Babey and Lance Dickieson, who covered the northern part of the meeting series, and Clare Curtin and Ed Nelson who covered the southern meetings. During the first week in April, these men took the Ontario Hog Marketing Board story to as many Alberta hog producers as they could reach. Mr. Dickieson and Mr. Curtin are Ontario Hog Producers' Marketing Board members. They gave a "first hand" account of the Ontario experience with a central selling agency for hogs.

FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA

9934 - 106 St., Edmonton, Alta.
Phone 424-0375
After 5:00 p.m.: 489-6955

The Organized Farmer

EDITOR — PAUL BABEY
Subscriptions — \$1.00 a year
Authorized Second Class Mail,
Post Office Department, Ottawa,
and for payment of postage in cash
FARMERS' UNION OF ALBERTA
9934 - 106 St., F.U.A. Bldg.,
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Printed by Co-op Press Ltd., Edmonton, Alta.

OPEN FORUM

THE INDIAN QUESTION

The article titled "What Can We Do?" concerning the plight of the Indian, in the Organized Farmer of February 28 by John Liss, has prompted this thought.

The question posed is the same one being asked by all charitable societies whenever a depressed group or race is recognized. In responding to such a question we need to examine the meaning of charity in its true context. In this case, our love and concern should provide a gift that will help the Indian help himself.

The annual convention of the Alberta Fish & Game Association endorsed a resolution designed to promote conservation of wildlife among the Indians, and set up a committee headed by the past president to be the implement.

The question has been asked again—how do you implement a program of this nature when all the emphasis is on the mumble jumble terms of a dozen or more treaties? Is it charitable to pay lip service to integration and full opportunity in a society where the Indian and white man live side by side but under different laws?

I believe the Indian has a distinct advantage and can be encouraged to use it. There is no doubt in my opinion that there are many capable Indian people who could train and educate their own people as well as take their place in any position in our mutual society.

—Elmer Kure

TAXES:- Paid and Unpaid

By Bill Harper, F.U.A. Radio Commentator

No One Likes To Pay Taxes

As individuals we grumble about tax, sales tax, property tax, school tax, and many others. Businessmen complain about corporation taxes, and are quite sure that high taxes are preventing business from expanding as much as it might.

We have never completely agreed to this. The Submission which the F.U.A. made before the Royal Commission on Taxation last August, said in part, "Taxes are a legitimate cost of doing business, and are, quite properly, added to the cost of the goods and services provided to their customers. Taxes are therefore collected by business, and turned over to the Government, but the consumer actually pays the tax. There is no other source from which it can come. The assumption that high taxes are imposing a hardship on business seems therefore doubtful."

This statement sparked some discussion at the hearing, and there seemed to be very little disagreement with it.

A very blunt and interesting statement on this matter appeared in the February issue of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce Newsletter. In an article headed, "National Prosperity and the Economic Climate" the following statement appears. "The fact of the matter is that only people pay taxes. Whether we pay it directly to the Government, in the form of a sales tax, or a personal tax, or whether we pay it in the form of increased prices for goods and services, or whether we pay it in enforced idleness because the corporation can no longer afford to keep us on the payroll, we—the taxpayers, the consumers—pay."

Fair Taxes

It seems to me that this is a most fundamental fact. You and I, the individual people in Canada, or in any other country, must bear the cost of running the country. Whenever we do a days work or buy a loaf of bread, or a new automobile, we contribute our share out of our pay cheque or out of the cost of the bread or the automobile, as taxes. The employer, or the company, who sells us the goods, collects the

tax for the Government, but we pay it.

The important thing for the Government to do, therefore, is to see that the tax load is fairly divided. This means keeping in mind that some people, who have low incomes, just can't afford to pay the same tax rate as those with a higher income. However, it does not always seem to work. I have been unable to dig up any figures for Canada, but a recent speech by Senator Albert Gore of the U.S. and a record of some questions asked and answered in the U.S. Senate on January 23, makes me wonder a bit. Here are some excerpts from his Senate speech. "It seems to me that neither equity nor economics dictates a reduction in rates paid by big interests. Corporations, we know, are largely owned by wealthy people. The poor people do not own General Motors or American Telephone and Telegraph stock. One per cent of individual taxpayers own about half of all corporation stock owned by individuals." Senator Gore then went on to say "we have been cutting tax rates in a disguised form, but these cuts have not really been effective in promoting investment and equipment. The most optimistic statements I have seen about the effects of the \$2 1/4 billion tax reductions given corp-

orations last year (are) that this had induced \$1.2 (investment) in plant and equipment. We give corporations a tax cut of \$2, to induce them to spend \$1 in plant and equipment.

Senator Humphrey, one of the grand old figures of the U.S. Senate said, on January 23, "we read about the 90% tax on incomes or the 75% tax on incomes, but the fact seems to be that when we examine the rates a worker who receives an income of less than \$10,000 a year may well be paying a larger per cent of his income in taxes than the multimillionaire." Senator Humphrey said in conclusion, "I never could quite understand how, if taxes were as high as people said they were, there would be any money left."

I don't know whether the situation is as bad in Canada as it is in the U.S. I hope not. But I am like Senator Humphrey—I wonder how a millionaire can live live a millionaire if he pays the tax he is supposed to. A Canadian with a million dollar income is supposed to pay 1/4 of that million dollars in taxes, leaving him only 3/4 million. In the U.S. he would have even less of it left after paying taxes. But apparently there are plenty of exemptions in the U.S. for people in this class, and practically none for the little fellow. This would indicate that the U.S. Government is not doing a very good job of distributing the tax load fairly.

I hope our Canadian Government is doing better.

Editor's Note: A new book, titled "The Great Treasury Robbery," by Phillip N. Stern, examines this subject in more detail.

F.W.U.A. STUDY FOR MAY

Vocational Training In Alberta Schools

By Mrs. C. James

At the annual F.W.U.A. convention last December, the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved that the minimum age for leaving school be raised to 16 unless the student has completed Grade X or vocational training."

When the FWUA brief was presented to the Premier and his Cabinet February 7th, this resolution was, of course, presented and invoked considerable discussion. Hon. A. O. Aalborg, Minister of Education, thought this would be a major change, quite a step to take, but thought it was definitely a good idea and worth giving careful study to by both the teachers and the school boards.

So maybe the time is ripe for the locals to discuss this further and decide whether they want to again ask the government to consider this resolution.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The "jewel" in Alberta's new ring of schools is the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology located in Edmonton. This project, and others like it across Canada, is being jointly financed by the Federal and Provincial Governments under the terms of the Technical and Vocational Training Agreement, whereby the Federal Government contributes 75% of all costs incurred up to March 31, 1963, and 50% of costs incurred thereafter.

The Institute is divided into four major divisions:

1. The Apprenticeship Division
2. The Technology Division
3. The Business Education — Vocational Division
4. The Evening Division

Besides the Institute, eighteen vocation high schools opened their doors in September. All are handling as many students as they can for the first year. Students enrolled in great numbers in the business education programs — 5,596 students — other courses in order of popularity are automotive, drafting, electricity and electronics and carpentry.

As of May 1, 1963, the name

Alberta School of Agriculture and Home Economics," was changed to "Alberta Agricultural and Vocational Colleges." The original schools were established in 1913. During the intervening years they have provided valuable training for future farmers and homemakers of the province. However, the courses have been somewhat

Women's Place In A New Farm Organization

By Mrs. C. James

As stated in the last article, Senator Cameron, Mr. Arnold Platt and Mr. Leonard Nesbitt were the committee appointed to compile a report on Farm Organizations in Alberta.

In dealing with F.U.A. locals they stated in part—"Your committee sees no need to interfere with existing farm union locals in the province except to make them creatures of the county organization."

In my opinion this also holds true in the F.W.U.A. I do not think it possible to have a strong organization without the grassroots support of locals. There will always be large and small locals, active and not-so-active locals, but no matter, each and every one is an important part of the whole. All of the members must have a place to express their opinion and the only way this is possible is at the local level.

The locals can also be a vital part of any community and some suggestions for participation might be: 'Help at Community Hall;

Thumbs Up For Crop Insurance

Crop Insurance Bill 134 has been passed by the Alberta Legislature. It incorporates the Alberta Crop Insurance Corporation, charged with developing and implementing a system of crop insurance in this province.

Under the terms of the Federal Crop Insurance Act passed in 1959, in conjunction with which the new Alberta Act will work, the Federal Government agrees to pay 50% of the Province's Crop Insurance Corporation administration costs, as well as 20% of a year's premiums, and can loan the Province up to 75% of the amount by which any repayments for crop losses exceed premiums paid in.

There are no compulsory factors in the Alberta plan. However, unless a designated area has at least 25% participation of those insurable, the Crop Insurance Corporation may not enter into any contracts in the area. Setting up of designated areas for the purposes of the Act will be the responsibility of the Corporation.

Commenting on the passage of Bill 134, FUA President Paul Babey said that he was pleased that the Alberta Government had gone ahead with crop insurance. "This has been FUA policy for many years," he said.

Mr. Babey said he believes that crop insurance will help to stabilize farm income. He pointed out that this is necessary because high production cost in modern agriculture have to be paid whether the farmer harvests a crop or not.

changed now to meet present day needs and there are some regional differences to meet the special needs of the area served by each of the three colleges.

Vocational Agriculture is one course offered at all three colleges. This course is designed to train students for farming and for employment in related occupations.

There are so many new fields opening up now and Vocational Training is so coming into its own that all students should be aware of the many opportunities available. If anyone interested, needs information, complete calendars of the Agricultural and Vocational Colleges may be obtained from the Department of Agriculture, Provincial Government. Also complete programs of the Institute of Technology are published by the Department of Education.

HOW TO USE OUR CLASSIFIED ADS.

When you want to buy or sell something our Classified Ads are the answer to your problem. Our newspaper is read by more active farmers than any other publication in the province, and the price is low. Use this ad section to your profit.

ORDER FORM

Please insert my add for _____ issues. Check:
Once a week ☐ Once every two weeks ☐ Once a month ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Please find enclosed \$ _____

Mail to: The Organized Farmer,
9934 - 106 Street, Edmonton, Alta.

Write one word in each space.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Number of words | 1 issue | 4 issues | 8 issues |
|-----------------|---------|----------|----------|
| up to 15 words | \$1.50 | \$ 5.40 | \$10.32 |
| 16-20 words | 2.00 | 7.20 | 13.76 |
| 21-25 words | 2.50 | 9.00 | 17.20 |
| 26-30 words | 3.00 | 10.80 | 20.64 |
| 31-35 words | 3.50 | 12.60 | 24.04 |

Special rates available for long-term advertisers.

LABOUR AND CO-OPERATIVES

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Dr. Alex Laidlaw, National Secretary of the Co-operative Union of Canada, speaking recently before a group of co-operative and labour leaders attending a Co-op - Labour Conference gave a deeply revealing look at relations between the two groups today. Much of what he said is applicable to the relations of other groups and movements to each other, and to co-operatives. For this reason, Mr. Laidlaw's talk is being reproduced in the Organized Farmer.

The first part appeared in the February 14 issue. What is not contained in this issue will be found in the May 1 number.

Briefly, the February 14 article stated the problem. Mr. Laidlaw said that the main issue facing Co-ops in Canada today is their lack of relative strength in the total economy. "Co-operatives are not a dominant force . . . as in certain other countries," he said. "As we see them growing at present, this is not likely to happen for a long, long time."

The Main Issue for Labour

When I turn to labour, I have to speak as one who is certainly not as close as I am to co-operatives. I have to describe the situation as I see it. What is the great issue for labour? To me, it is the question of ownership. Who will own the economy that serves you? More and more, ownership is tending to various kinds of collective ownership. The idea of ownership as our grandparents knew it in the 19th century is fast disappearing. Private or individual forms of ownership are on the decline. From the way we see large apartment buildings going up in our cities today, even home ownership is probably on the way out.

What are the things that make up our economic life in the city? Home, credit, consumer goods, insurance—these are the things that mean economic power and ownership—and labour doesn't own them. Labour as represented by unions has not moved into ownership. For example, as far as I know, labour in Canada—unlike labour in other countries—has not sponsored housing of any significance; or practically anything at all which labour can be said to own. I mentioned insurance a moment ago—labour doesn't have ownership in this important field of our economic life. And again, that is different from labour in other countries of the world. We look across Canada today, and we see plants going up everywhere—and here I am pointing out differences between farmers and labour—in a typical year like 1962-63 farmers in Canada built for themselves co-operative plants valued at between 20 and 25 million dollars. But what has labour built that it owns?

And labour as represented by the members has not organized for ownership; except in credit unions, and even there they are often content to allow others to run them. Farmers have placed great store by ownership; labour has put the emphasis on being served by others.

Then, I summarize these two issues as follows: co-operatives must realize that the great majority of Canadians can become co-operators only through urban co-operatives, even though they may be employed in agriculture. (If you go to a typical city in Canada today, take Calgary for example, you fill hundreds of people working for agricultural co-operatives; but they themselves can be served personally only

through urban co-operatives, even though they work for agricultural co-operatives.) And for labour, you must realize that it is only through co-operatives that you are going to realize an important part of your ownership. You will get some of your collective ownership through socialization, in fact a great deal of it; but the other part of it you can secure only through co-operatives.

So, the two movements, labour and co-operatives, must look at these two fundamental issues. I am reminded of the sign that a restaurant owner used to have over his restaurant on the Sydney Road. It read: "Stop and eat here or we'll both starve." The same may be said for labour and co-operatives. Labour has to stop and eat here, or both the co-operative movement and labour will be thinner for it.

The dialogue

Now, I assume that we want to get together, that we want to understand each other, that we have a genuine desire to work more closely together, that we want to establish communications with each other. But we might as well face it; in some parts of the country we are not even on speaking terms. I have with me a letter in which a high officer on one side of the gathering as represented here today writes: "My patience on this question is about exhausted and unless some basic change in attitude is soon evident, I can see little use in attempting to promote any understanding with these people." The ones he refers to as "these people" are the groups represented here today.

I have sought for a parallel situation and I think I have found one in the main branches of Christianity. Once upon a time it was assumed that there was no solution to the enmity between the main branches of Christianity, Catholic and Protestant—no solution but to exterminate each other. And both sides tried hard to do it—and both sides committed crimes to that end. But then they reached another stage when they learned to live together, and some accommodation took place. And now finally today we seem to be entering a new stage of understanding; there is a sharing of interests, a recognition of areas for collaboration, a searching for ways to know each other better.

Now, how was this brought about? we have a new word for it—"the dialogue". We have learned to talk to each other; we have learned to meet; we have smoothed out the channels of communication between us. And in the midst of the new realization that the Christian religions were able to get together, certain theologians started to write rules for the dialogue, and one well known theologian, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, wrote what he called "The rules for the dialogue" and these were published simultaneously in both Protestant and Catholic Journals—they appeared for example in The Commonweal and The Christian Century.

It is interesting to look at these rules and compare them with the rules which I think we have to learn in order to get together and establish a dialogue between us. Here they are:

1. Each partner must believe that the other is speaking in good faith.
2. Each partner must have a clear understanding of his own faith.
3. Each partner must strive for a clear understanding of the faith of the other.

4. Each partner must accept responsibility, in humility and patience, for what his group has done and is doing to foster and perpetuate division.
5. Each partner must forthrightly face the issues which cause separation as well as those which create unity.

There was a sixth which I will read but it doesn't particularly apply here:

6. Each partner must recognize that all that can be done with the dialogue is to offer it up to God.

Each of us here would do well to learn these rules and seek to apply them in our situation: believe that the other is speaking in good faith, have a clear understanding of our own movement and try to understand the other, accept responsibility for our errors, and face the issues that cause separation and those that create unity. We too must learn the rules for dialogue between labour and co-ops.

The difference from labour's viewpoint

You have asked me to speak of "similarities and differences". May I turn them around and speak first of the differences.

The best way to identify differences is to ask what I don't like about you. Let me first try to point out the faults in co-operatives from the viewpoint of labour. What are the weak points in the co-operative position? What does labour find in co-operatives to criticize most? What do labour union dislike about co-operatives? Where are the differences?

1. The first I would identify is the attitude of paternalism

to employees, the attitude that says "we know what is best for you". Labour says in reply: It is for us to judge, not you, what is good for us. Just as farmers don't wait for permission from Canada Packers to organize a marketing co-operative, neither should the employees have to wait for permission from the people to whom they are going to sell their product—labour.

2. Management in co-operatives often treats employees in about the same way as other business—one frequently hears that criticism.

3. We often encounter this criticism: many agricultural co-operatives try to maintain the fiction that they operate in a rural environment. They seem to say: "Just leave us alone—we

(Continued on page 4)



FARMING IS A "CASH REGISTER" BUSINESS

That's why the U.F.A. Co-op exists—because farming is a cash register business—and every dollar you save on farm supplies puts money in your till!

The five U.F.A. Co-op Farm Supply Centres in Alberta (three more to open soon) sell farm supplies at the lowest possible cost—and on a co-operative basis. Whatever you buy from the U.F.A. Co-op Farm Supply Centre is quality merchandise, low priced, and subject to a cash rebate. (Cash rebates last year were 6.75 per cent of purchases).

Similarly, the U.F.A. Co-op Maple Leaf Agency (there is one in your district and more than 170 in the province) is in business to sell you petroleum products of highest quality, made for Alberta farm needs and backed by the guarantee of satisfaction or your money returned. When you buy Maple Leaf you get a personal patronage dividend in direct proportion to the amount you spend. (Patronage dividends last year were 11.3 per cent).



UNITED FARMERS
OF ALBERTA CO-OP

"Owned by farmers—controlled by farmers—
and operated SOLELY for the benefit of farmers."

CHARTERS on Super DC-8 Jets AVAILABLE

Any club or organization can take advantage of Canadian Pacific's low charter rates on Super DC-8 Jets to anywhere in the world. For complete information, call your Travel Agent or any Canadian Pacific office.

FLY
Canadian Pacific
TRAINS/TRUCKS/SHIPS/PLANES/HOTELS/TELECOMMUNICATIONS
WORLD'S MOST COMPLETE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

LABOUR AND CO-OPERATIVES

(Continued from page 3)

will run this business as we like — only leave us alone." But surely a business located in a city, using urban services, employing urban people, and selling its produce to the urban population can't expect to operate by its own rules.

4. The fourth thing that makes for differences between the movements, as I see it, is the failure on the part of co-operatives to appreciate the importance of security to labour. This is a difference of viewpoint — labour views security in its own way. Labour wants security here and now — they don't want it ten years from now, or twenty — they have to live today. Co-operatives and farm people think of security in the long run. The farmer builds security into something that he hopes to enjoy in the far distant future. Labour can't do that. It has to interpret security in terms of this week.

5. Co-operative leaders — to take another point — tend to judge all labour by its worst representatives. They know all about the labour man who is a thug, but nothing about the one who is a Sunday-school teacher. They know all the details about one dispute that comes to a strike, but little of the 99 negotiations that are settled peacefully and amiably.

6. Co-operative leaders sometimes presume to select the spokesmen for labour from among the employees. Not long ago I had occasion to chat with a co-operative leader who was doing that very thing — a very well-meaning man, a very sincere man, but he presumed that he could choose the officers for the union. He told a union leader that he was too young to be the employees' spokesman and so he refused to recognize the union — failing to realize that the young single fellow was about the only man in the community who was free, who had nothing to fear as a result of organization.

7. Another difference between the two movements from the viewpoint of labour is that some co-operative leaders are using the political issue as a bogey-man where it doesn't really exist, merely to keep labour at arm's length.

8. Another great weakness, I think, on the co-operative side is the lack of information. Co-operative people do not have sufficient or full information, widely broadcast and understood, about labour's needs. Take one example that was in the headlines in the last few weeks. It concerns the matter of quotations of wage-rates by the hour, where co-operative leaders fail to translate hourly wages into annual income. It was the case of the longshoremen in Montreal. It was well publicized that the I.L.A. member earned \$2.30 an hour, but few are aware that it worked out to about \$3200 per year, a figure on which you can't maintain a family in decency in Montreal.

9. And finally here is one other thing that tends to cause a sharp difference between the two movements: from their rural viewpoint co-operatives fail to understand labour's fear of technological change. Labour has always feared technological change — and for good reasons. In the early industrial revolution the workingmen broke the machines because they were a threat to their jobs. But by contrast agriculture welcomes technological change; farmers seize on advance in technology as quickly as they can because, for the better and more advanced farmers at least, it means prosperity. Agriculture doesn't have the same fear of technology because it can push some of the problems resulting from it into the nearest city, and that is exactly what is happening today. As many thousands of farm workers became technologically unemployable, they simply move to the nearest urban centre. But urban industry can't reverse the process; it can't throw its cast-off unemployed back onto the land. It has to keep them — they stay in the labour market and compete for jobs. Agriculture and co-operatives must try to see labour's view and understand its fear.

The differences from the co-operative viewpoint

Now, let us look at the other side of the picture. From the viewpoint of co-operatives, where are the differences?

1. Co-operative people with good cause say to labour: You fail to understand co-operatives — to you they are just another business to organize. You do not differentiate between co-operatives and other business. You don't see the difference between the meat-packing plant that has been piling up profits for 50 years and a small struggling co-operative starting now from scratch.

2. Co-operatives say too that, even when labour does recognize the difference between co-operatives and other business, it wants

Citizenship Seminar Theme: "Sharing Our Heritage"

Again this year, the Farm Women's Union of Alberta will sponsor a Citizenship Seminar for Indian and non-Indian young people at the Gold Eye Lake Camp. This third annual Citizenship Seminar, the only one of its kind in Canada, will be held August 9-15. Theme of the session is "Sharing Our Heritage." Gold Eye, the Jr. F.U.A. Camp, is 110 miles west of Red Deer, in the mountains.

J. R. LOVE APPOINTED TO C.I.S. EXECUTIVE

At the first annual meeting of C.I.S. Ltd. (Co-operative Insurance Services), March 4, in Regina, the shareholders elected J. R. Love of Edmonton, to the Board of Directors. At the Board meeting the following day, Mr. Love was appointed to the Executive Committee. Mr. Love is Vice-President of the Co-op Press Ltd., in Edmonton. He will also serve on the Executive Committee of Co-operative Life Insurance and Co-operative Fire and Casualty Companies, controlled and managed by C.I.S. Ltd.

C.I.S. Ltd. was set up to ensure that control of Co-op Life and Co-op Fire and Casualty remains in the hands of the co-op and credit union movement in Canada. Shareholders in C.I.S. Ltd. are the major co-operative and credit union organizations in the six regions in which the Company operates.

to take unfair advantage. They say you organize the co-operative as a sitting duck, and then you don't move to organize the others. And so some co-operatives are saying: organize other business first and then we'll fall in line.

MARKET PLEBISCITE . . .

(Continued from page 1)

northern half of the Province. The Vice Chairman, Mr. Clare Curtin and myself attended nine in the southern half. Each of us travelled over 1500 miles and we spoke to a total of 1500 farmers at the 18 meetings. Some meetings were well attended and some were very poor. We found very little opposition expressed at these meetings and where an expression of opinion was asked for, a very large majority voted in favor of board marketing.

In addition to the above, over seventy meetings have been held at which some member of the hog committee has been present. All report keen interest and an average attendance of 30 per meeting. Here too, the majority seems to favor board marketing.

When the organizations decided to ask for a plebiscite it was hoped that farmers would appreciate the opportunity to express their feelings on this matter and would contribute financially to the effort on their behalf. Up to the present, they have done little more than pay for renting of halls and meeting places. Most people do not seem to realize the cost of carrying on a campaign of this nature and I can only hope the locals will prevail on their members to make some worthwhile contributions. In the end, this may be the last time that some 30,000 individual producers will have an opportunity to express themselves on the matter of retaining an open market for their products!

More than 60 kinds of crops are grown commercially in Canada.

Purpose of the seminar is to provide an "inter-cultural experience" for young adults attending. The highest traditions from each group, which have contributed to life in Canada, will be stressed. The camp experience is intended to provide the participants with an opportunity to examine, through discussion, the individual's role in society.

Alberta young people who have taken grade 11 or its equivalent, and who are 21 years of age or under, are eligible to attend. A registration fee of \$25 for each student covers cost of transportation by bus from Red Deer and return, and room and board while at the camp.

Staff leaders will be responsible for educational sessions, while the

camp as a whole will be responsible for its own vocational and recreational programs. In past years staff has been drawn from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Department of Indian Affairs and the F.W.U.A., and individuals from both Indian and non-Indian communities.

All applications must be in by June 30. These should be sent to: Citizenship Seminar, F.W.U.A., 9934-106 Street, Edmonton, Alberta. Registration forms, and further information can be obtained from the same address.

When making application, the name, address, telephone number, age, sex, last grade completed, school being attended, special abilities (music, language, dramatics, etc.), and special interests of the student should be included.

Another Racket

By Bill Harper, F.U.A. Radio Commentator

Spring is one of the times when the racketeers take to the road and sell various kinds of gadgets and products, many of them of doubtful value, to hundreds of people who should know better than to buy them.

Some salesmen in parts of Alberta are selling spruce fence posts. These posts are pressure treated, so the sharpies say, with diesel fuel, and this is supposed to make them almost everlasting. This just is not true! Spruce rots very quickly in the ground, as any farmer should know, and diesel fuel, while it will help a bit is a very poor substitute for a good wood preservative.

The really bad part of this racket is that these salesmen are said to be stating that the Department of Agriculture is recommending these posts and this method of treatment. I have been talking to Agricultural Engineers

at the Dept. of Agriculture, and they tell me that this definitely is not so. No department employee will recommend any specific product, because this is in effect advertising, and the government cannot advertise any product for anyone.

It is possible to mix some wood preservatives with diesel oil and use the mixture for pressure treating, but in this case the diesel oil is just a carrier and thinner for the preservative. It has good penetrating power, and possibly may be useful in such a mixture, but diesel itself will not prevent wood from rotting to any great extent. There are a number of reliable companies in Alberta, who are in the business of treating fence posts, bridge timbers and other wood products. Some of them are small concerns but usually their products are good, because they use good quality preservatives on posts cut from suitable wood.

It is also quite possible for a farmer to treat his own posts. Your district agriculturist has bulletins describing how this can best be done, and telling you the amount and kinds of wood preservatives which are satisfactory.

There is no need for anyone to get caught in a racket of this sort. I want to urge all farmers once more not to be taken in by some smooth operator whom you have never seen before, and who cannot positively identify himself as being connected with a reliable company.

First of all, these so-called salesmen must have a provincial license, and this license expires on March 31st, so be sure you ask to see his license and check the date. If he has any excuses, you know there is something wrong. Secondly, take his name, license number and his car license number. Thirdly, don't be stampeded into paying him a cent until you have checked with someone, concerning his goods, and don't pay for anything before it is delivered.

Don't fall for the old song and dance about this being the last day this offer is good, etc. This is nonsense. A reliable salesman will show you his license without being asked, will let you examine it in detail and will not rush you into paying. Finally, if you have reason to be suspicious phone the Better Business Bureau, or FUA Head Office. You might even give the RCMP a buzz. They usually know about these sharpies, but they are helpless to do anything unless someone lays a charge.

Don't be a sucker. It is so embarrassing when you find out.

CLASSIFIED SECTION

AGENTS

FARMERS ONLY — Steady monthly income. You may qualify as our demonstrating agent. Demonstrate Comet Farm Equipment in your spare time. Machines on consignment. Write for qualifications. Smith-Roles, Dept. 0, Saskatoon, Sask.

EMPLOYMENT

COOK NEEDED — For Jr. F.U.A. Goldeye Camp in July, August. State salary expected per month. Enclose with application a planned menu and food list for fifty persons for one week. Apply to Farmers' Union of Alberta, 9934-106 Street, Edmonton.

WELDING

FOR SALE — 180 amp. Forney Welder used very little. Complete with cables, helmet, torch, solder iron. Guaranteed for one year. Will ship C.O.D. with a \$25.00 deposit. Price \$149.00. Write only to A. Hader, 3864, Brighton Drive, Calgary.

SEED GRAIN

Nordan Crested Wheat Grass Seed. Registered 25c, unregistered 20c per lb. Gould Bros., Consort, Alberta. Phone R 1305, Consort.

RUSSIAN WILD RYE GRASS SEED — Good quality, high germination. Grade 1, \$45; Grade 2, \$40 per 100 pounds. Tall Wheatgrass \$47 per 100 pounds delivered to nearest station. Claresholm Russian Wild Rye Grass Seed Ltd., Box 86, Claresholm, Alberta.

Look for this symbol when you buy seed



Foundation & Registered
Grower
HIGH QUALITY SEED
BARLEY

- Gateway 63—sold out
- Jubilee • Parkland

J. H. McLAUGHLIN,
Spruce Grove, Alta.